

Reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures, and lifting tractability from finite-domain constraint satisfaction

Manuel Bodirsky* Antoine Mottet*[†]

November 22, 2016

Abstract

Many natural decision problems can be formulated as constraint satisfaction problems for reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures. This class of problems is a large generalisation of the class of CSPs over finite domains. Our first result is a general polynomial-time reduction from such infinite-domain CSPs to finite-domain CSPs. We use this reduction to obtain new powerful polynomial-time tractability conditions that can be expressed in terms of topological polymorphism clones. Moreover, we study the subclass $\mathcal{C}$ of CSPs for structures that are first-order definable over equality with parameters. Also this class $\mathcal{C}$ properly extends the class of all finite-domain CSPs. We show that the tractability conjecture for reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures is for $\mathcal{C}$ equivalent to the finite-domain tractability conjecture.

1 Introduction

Many computational problems in various areas of theoretical computer science can be formulated as *constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs)*. Constraint satisfaction problems where the variables take values from a finite domain are reasonably well understood with respect to their computational complexity. The Feder-Vardi dichotomy conjecture for finite domain CSPs, which states that every finite-domain CSP is either in P or NP-complete, is still open, but there is a stronger *tractability conjecture* [26] which provides an effective characterisation of those finite-domain CSPs that are NP-complete, and those that are conjectured to be in P. The tractability conjecture has been confirmed in many special cases:

*Institut für Algebra, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany. {manuel.bodirsky,antoine.mottet}@tu-dresden.de. Both authors have received funding from the ERC under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013 Grant Agreement no. 257039), and the DFG-funded project 'Homogene Strukturen, Bedingungserfüllungsprobleme, und topologische Klone' (Project number 622397).

[†]Antoine Mottet is supported by DFG Graduiertenkolleg 1763 (QuantLA).

- for finite structures on domains of size two [38] and three [24],
- for finite undirected graphs [28] and finite directed graphs without sources and sinks [4].

The strongest complexity classification results have been obtained using concepts and results from universal algebra. The universal-algebraic approach can also be applied to classify the complexity of some classes of CSPs over infinite domains. This approach works particularly well if the constraints can be defined over a homogeneous structure with finite relational signature. The class of CSPs that can be formulated in this way is a considerable extension of the class of CSPs over finite domains, and captures many computational problems that have been studied in various research areas. For example, almost all CSPs studied in qualitative temporal and spatial reasoning belong to this class [9].

The computational complexity of the CSPs where the constraints can be defined over $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$ has been classified [13]. Also constraint languages definable over the random graph [16] or over homogeneous tree-like structures [11] have been classified. These results were obtained by using a generalisation of the universal-algebraic approach from finite-domain CSPs, and structural Ramsey theory. However, it would be desirable to go further and to reduce complexity classification tasks for CSPs over infinite domains to the rather more advanced classification results that are known (or have been conjectured) for finite-domain CSPs.

In this paper, we present a first result in this direction. We study structures that are *first-order definable structures with atoms* [33] which recently attracted attention in automata theory as a natural class of infinite structures with finite descriptions; see [21, 22, 34], and references therein. In the context of constraint satisfaction problems they were first studied in [33], where the authors focussed on structures that are additionally *locally finite*, a very strong restriction that is not needed for our approach.

We now state our results in more detail. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a structure with a finite relational signature. The *constraint satisfaction problem* for $\mathbb{A}$, denoted by $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$, is the following computational problem:

Input. A conjunction $\phi = \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_m$ of atomic formulas over the signature of $\mathbb{A}$.

Question. Is ϕ satisfiable in $\mathbb{A}$?

An example of a problem that can be formulated in this way is the three-colouring problem, which can be formulated as $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ where the domain A of $\mathbb{A}$ has size three and the signature contains a single binary relation that denotes the inequality relation $\neq$ on A . In order to answer whether a given finite graph G is 3-colourable, each edge $\{u, v\}$ of G will be represented by a constraint of the form $u \neq v$. The graph is 3-colourable if and only if the corresponding system of constraints has a solution.

Another example is the problem to decide whether a given set of constraints of the form $x = y$ or of the form $x \neq y$ has a solution (over any domain). This can be formulated as $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ where the domain of $\mathbb{A}$ is any countably infinite

set A , and $=$ and $\neq$ denote the usual equality and inequality relation on A . Clearly, this problem cannot be formulated as $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{B})$ for a structure $\mathbb{B}$ over a finite domain (neither can it be formulated with a locally finite structure $\mathbb{B}$ as considered in [33]).

We study the computational complexity of $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ for the class of structures $\mathbb{A}$ that have a countably infinite domain A and a finite relational signature such that all relations in $\mathbb{A}$ have a first-order definition using equality and constants from A . This class (properly) generalises the class of constraint satisfaction problems over finite domains. One of our main results is the following.

Theorem 1. *If the tractability conjecture for finite-domain CSPs is true, then every CSP for a structure that is definable over a countable set using equality and constants is in P or NP -complete.*

In fact, we prove a stronger result: we show that the tractability conjecture from [18] for *reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures* (see item 2 below) is for our class of CSPs equivalent to the tractability conjecture for finite domains. In contrast to the three classification results for infinite-domain CSPs mentioned above [11, 13, 16], which involve many combinatorial case distinctions, we reduce the combinatorial work to the situation in the finite via purely conceptual arguments, building on various recent general results about topological clones [5, 18, 19].

The class of CSPs studied here is a subclass of almost any more ambitious classification project for infinite-domain CSPs. We give some examples.

1. We have already mentioned that our structures are *structures definable with atoms* in the sense of [33]; this class of structures appeared under different names in various contexts (Fraenkel-Mostowski models, nominal sets, permutation models) and has not yet been studied systematically from the CSP viewpoint.
2. An important class of infinite structures that have finite representations and where the universal-algebraic approach can be applied is the class of *finitely bounded homogeneous structures*, and more generally structures that can be defined over finitely bounded homogeneous structures. For details we have to refer to Section 3; there, we also show that our class is a subclass. In fact, some of our results (e.g., Theorem 3 and Theorem 10) hold in this general setting.
3. Many CSPs that are of special interest in computer science and mathematics are formulated over classical structures such as the integers, the rationals, or the reals. Some first partial classifications are available also for such CSPs [14, 15, 32]. The natural question here is whether one can classify the CSP for all structures definable over $(\mathbb{Z}; +, \leq)$, that is, for fragments of Presburger arithmetic, or for all structures that are definable over $(\mathbb{Q}; +, \leq, 1)$ or even $(\mathbb{R}; +, \times)$. Note that infinitely many constants are definable in these structures, and that our class will appear as a subclass of these large classes of problems.

4. It is natural to ask for the classification of the CSP for all structures that are *first-order interpretable* (in the model theoretic sense) over a fixed infinite structure (for example, over $(\mathbb{N}, =)$ or over $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$). Even if the interpretation is without parameters, such a class necessarily allows to formulate all the CSPs that will be considered in this paper (the reason is that with respect to the CSP, constants in first-order definitions can be simulated with interpretations of appropriately chosen dimension).

Theorem 1 is based on a universal-algebraic result of independent interest that generalises the cyclic term theorem of Barto and Kozik [3] and can be stated without reference to the CSP and to computational complexity (Section 5). We write π_i^m for the m -ary projection to the i -th argument.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a closed function clone on a countably infinite domain A such that the unary operations in $\mathcal{C}$ are precisely the injective functions that preserve $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then exactly one of the following holds:*

- *there is a continuous clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{C}$ to the clone of projections on a two-element set;*
- *there are $e_1, e_2, f \in \mathcal{C}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_m \in A, \quad e_1 f(x_1, \dots, x_m) = e_2 f(x_2, \dots, x_m, x_1).$$

Our strategy to prove Theorem 1 is then as follows: we first reduce the task to the situation that the polymorphism clone of the structure $\mathbb{A}$ under consideration satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2 (in Section 6). If the first case of this theorem applies, hardness of the CSP follows from general principles [5]. If the second case applies, we associate to $\mathbb{A}$ a structure over a finite domain, show that if the tractability conjecture is true then this structure has a polynomial-time tractable CSP, and finally prove that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ reduces to this finite-domain CSP.

Our reduction from infinite-domain CSPs to finite-domains CSPs is very general, and is another main contribution of this paper (Section 3). All that is needed here is that $\mathbb{A}$ is definable in a finitely bounded relational structure. For structures $\mathbb{A}$ that are definable in a finitely bounded *homogeneous* relational structure, this reduction yields new powerful tractability conditions, formulated in terms of the topological polymorphism clone of $\mathbb{A}$, using known (unconditional) tractability conditions for finite-domain constraint satisfaction (in Section 4).

2 Notation

We denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$. A *signature* τ is a set of function symbols and relation symbols, where each symbol is associated with a natural number, called its *arity*. A τ -*structure* $\mathbb{A}$ is a tuple $(A; (Z^{\mathbb{A}})_{Z \in \tau})$ such that:

- $Z^{\mathbb{A}} \subseteq A^k$ if Z is a relation symbol of arity k , and
- $Z^{\mathbb{A}}: A^k \rightarrow A$ if Z is a function symbol of arity k . Function symbols of arity 0 are called *constant symbols*.

Structures are denoted by blackboard bold letters, while their base sets are denoted by the corresponding capital roman letter. Let $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$ be τ -structures with $B \subseteq A$. $\mathbb{B}$ is a *substructure* of $\mathbb{A}$ if:

- for every $R_i \in \tau$ of arity k , $R_i^{\mathbb{B}} = R_i^{\mathbb{A}} \cap B^k$, and
- for every function symbol $f_i \in \tau$ of arity k , $f_i^{\mathbb{B}} = f_i^{\mathbb{A}}|_B$.

A *homomorphism* between two structures $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$ with the same signature τ is a function $h: A \rightarrow B$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in R^{\mathbb{A}} \Rightarrow (h(a_1), \dots, h(a_k)) \in R^{\mathbb{B}}$ for every relation symbol $R \in \tau$, and such that for every function symbol $f \in \tau$, $h(f^{\mathbb{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_k)) = f^{\mathbb{B}}(h(a_1), \dots, h(a_k))$. When $h: A \rightarrow A$ is a homomorphism from $\mathbb{A}$ to itself we say that h is an *endomorphism*. An injection function $h: A \rightarrow B$ is an *embedding* if we have $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in R^{\mathbb{A}} \Leftrightarrow (h(a_1), \dots, h(a_k)) \in R^{\mathbb{B}}$. A surjective embedding is called an *isomorphism*, and an *automorphism* when $\mathbb{A}$ equals $\mathbb{B}$.

For the following definitions $\mathbb{A}$ is a *relational* τ -structure (that is, τ only contains relation symbols). A function $h: A^k \rightarrow A$ is a *polymorphism* of $\mathbb{A}$ if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every symbol $R \in \tau$ of arity n , and for all n -tuples $\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^k$ in R , we have that $h(\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^k)$ is in R , where h is applied componentwise. We write $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A}), \text{End}(\mathbb{A}), \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ for the sets of automorphisms, endomorphisms, and polymorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$. A relational structure $\mathbb{B}$ with the same domain as $\mathbb{A}$ is called a (*quantifier-free*) *reduct* of $\mathbb{A}$ if all the relations of $\mathbb{B}$ are definable by (quantifier-free) first-order formulas in $\mathbb{A}$.

3 Finitely Bounded Structures

The *age* of a relational structure $\mathbb{A}$, denoted by $\text{Age}(\mathbb{A})$, is the class of all finite structures that embed into $\mathbb{A}$. A *bound* of a class $\mathcal{C}$ of structures over a fixed finite relational signature τ is a finite structure that does not embed into a structure from $\mathcal{C}$, and that is minimal with this property (with respect to embeddability). A class of τ -structures is called *finitely bounded* if it has finitely many bounds up to isomorphism. Note that an age is finitely bounded if and only if it has a *finite universal axiomatisation*, that is, there exists a universal first-order sentence ϕ such that $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{C}$ iff $\mathbb{B} \models \phi$. A structure is called *finitely bounded* if its age is. The constraint satisfaction problem of a structure might be undecidable in general. But the CSP of a finitely bounded relational structure is in NP.

The *quantifier-free (qf-) type* of a tuple $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$, also called an *m-type* in $\mathbb{B}$, is the set of all quantifier-free formulas $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_m)$ such that $\mathbb{B} \models \phi(b_1, \dots, b_m)$. If $\mathbb{B}$ has a finite relational signature then there are only finitely many *m-types* in $\mathbb{B}$.

Let m be a positive integer. We define $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$ to be the structure whose domain is the set of m -types of $\mathbb{B}$ and whose relations are as follows.

- for each symbol R of $\mathbb{A}$ of arity r , let $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ be a definition of R in $\mathbb{B}$. For $i: [r] \rightarrow [m]$ we write $\langle \chi(z_{i(1)}, \dots, z_{i(r)}) \rangle$ for the unary relation that consists of all the types that contain $\chi(z_{i(1)}, \dots, z_{i(r)})$, and add all such relations to $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$.
- for each $r \in [m]$ and $i, j: [r] \rightarrow [m]$, define $\text{Comp}_{i,j}$ to be the binary relation that contains the pairs (p, q) of m -types such that for every quantifier-free formula $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_s)$ of $\mathbb{B}$ and $t: [s] \rightarrow [r]$, the formula $\chi(z_{it(1)}, \dots, z_{it(s)})$ is in p iff $\chi(z_{jt(1)}, \dots, z_{jt(s)})$ is in q .

Note that if $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ is of type p and $(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ of type q , then $\text{Comp}_{i,j}(p, q)$ holds if and only if $(a_{i(1)}, \dots, a_{i(r)})$ and $(b_{j(1)}, \dots, b_{j(r)})$ have the same type in $\mathbb{B}$. The next theorem holds for arbitrary finitely bounded structures $\mathbb{B}$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a quantifier-free reduct of a finitely bounded structure $\mathbb{B}$, and suppose that $\mathbb{A}$ has a finite signature. Let m_a be the maximal arity of a relation in $\mathbb{A}$ or $\mathbb{B}$, and m_b be the maximal size of a bound for $\mathbb{B}$. Let m be at least $\max(m_a, m_b, 3)$. Then there is a polynomial-time reduction from $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ to $\text{CSP}(T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A}))$.*

Proof. We show that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ reduces in polynomial-time to $\text{CSP}(T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A}))$. Let Ψ be an instance of $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ with variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Assume without loss of generality that $n \geq m$. We build an instance Φ of $\text{CSP}(T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A}))$ as follows.

- The variable set of Φ is the set I of order-preserving injections from $[m]$ to $[n]$. The idea of the reduction is that the variable $v \in I$ of Φ represents the qf-type of $(h(x_{v(1)}), \dots, h(x_{v(m)}))$ in a satisfying assignment h for Ψ .
- For each conjunct ψ of Ψ we add unary constraints to Φ as follows. The formula ψ must be of the form $R(x_{j(1)}, \dots, x_{j(r)})$ where R is a relation of $\mathbb{A}$ and $j: [r] \rightarrow [n]$. By assumption, R has a qf-definition $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ over $\mathbb{B}$. Let $v \in I$ be such that $\text{Im}(j) \subseteq \text{Im}(v)$. Let U be the relation symbol of $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$ that denotes the unary relation $\langle \chi(z_{v^{-1}j(1)}, \dots, z_{v^{-1}j(r)}) \rangle$. We then add $U(v)$ to Φ .
- Finally, for all $u, v \in I$ let $k: [r] \rightarrow \text{Im}(u) \cap \text{Im}(v)$ be a bijection. We then add the constraint $\text{Comp}_{u^{-1}k, v^{-1}k}(u, v)$.

Let $a_1, \dots, a_n$ be elements of $\mathbb{B}$, let $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ be a formula in the language of $\mathbb{B}$, let $j: [r] \rightarrow [n]$, and let v in I be such that $\text{Im}(j) \subseteq \text{Im}(v)$. We first note the following property:

$$\begin{aligned} (\dagger) \quad & \mathbb{B} \models \chi(a_{j(1)}, \dots, a_{j(r)}) \\ \text{iff} \quad & (a_{v(1)}, \dots, a_{v(m)}) \text{ satisfies } \chi(z_{v^{-1}j(1)}, \dots, z_{v^{-1}j(r)}) \text{ in } \mathbb{B}. \end{aligned}$$

The property $(\dagger)$ holds since in the type of the tuple $(a_{v(1)}, \dots, a_{v(m)})$, the variable z_i represents the element $a_{v(i)}$, and therefore $z_{v^{-1}j(i)}$ represents $a_{j(i)}$.

Suppose that $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ satisfies Ψ in $\mathbb{A}$. To show that Φ is satisfiable in $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$, define $g: I \rightarrow T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$ by setting $g(v)$ to be the type of $(a_{v(1)}, \dots, a_{v(m)})$ in $\mathbb{B}$, for every $v \in I$. To see that all the constraints of Φ are satisfied by g , let $U(v)$ be a constraint in Φ that has been introduced for a conjunct of the form $R(x_{j(1)}, \dots, x_{j(r)})$ in Ψ . Let $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ be the qf-formula that defines R in $\mathbb{B}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A} &\models R(a_{j(1)}, \dots, a_{j(r)}) \\ \Rightarrow \mathbb{B} &\models \chi(a_{j(1)}, \dots, a_{j(r)}) \\ \Rightarrow \chi(z_{v^{-1}j(1)}, \dots, z_{v^{-1}j(m)}) &\in g(v) \\ \Rightarrow T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A}) &\models U(g(v)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second implication holds because of $(\dagger)$.

Next, consider a constraint of the form $\text{Comp}_{u^{-1}k, v^{-1}k}(u, v)$ in Φ , and let $r := |\text{Im}(k)|$. Let $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_s)$ be a qf-formula in the language of $\mathbb{B}$ and let $t: [s] \rightarrow [r]$. Suppose that $\chi(z_{u^{-1}kt(1)}, \dots, z_{u^{-1}kt(s)})$ is in $g(u)$. From $(\dagger)$ we obtain that $\mathbb{B} \models \chi(a_{kt(1)}, \dots, a_{kt(s)})$. Again by $(\dagger)$ we get that $\chi(z_{v^{-1}kt(1)}, \dots, z_{v^{-1}kt(s)})$ is in $g(v)$. Hence, it is true that $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A}) \models \text{Comp}_{u^{-1}k, v^{-1}k}(g(u), g(v))$.

Conversely, suppose that Φ is satisfiable in $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$. That is, there exists a map h from I to the m -types in $\mathbb{B}$ that satisfies all conjuncts of Φ . We show how to obtain an assignment of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ that satisfies Ψ in $\mathbb{A}$. For each $v_i \in I$, let $\mathbb{C}_i$ be a substructure of $\mathbb{B}$ induced by (not necessarily distinct) elements $g_1^i, \dots, g_m^i \in B$ such that the qf-type of $(g_1^i, \dots, g_m^i)$ in $\mathbb{B}$ is $h(v_i)$. Define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the disjoint union of $\{g_p^i\}$ as follows. Given $g_p^i \in \mathbb{C}_i$ and $g_q^j \in \mathbb{C}_j$, let k be such that the image of $v_k \in I$ contains $v_i(p)$ and $v_j(q)$. Finally, let $g_p^i \sim g_q^j$ iff $g_{v_k^{-1}v_i(p)}^k = g_{v_k^{-1}v_j(q)}^k$. This is indeed an equivalence relation. Reflexivity and symmetry are easy to check. Assume that $g_p^i \sim g_q^j$ and $g_q^j \sim g_r^k$. Let $(i|j)$ be such that $v_{i|j}$ contains $v_i(p)$ and $v_j(q)$ and such that $g_{v_{i|j}^{-1}v_i(p)}^{i|j} = g_{v_{i|j}^{-1}v_j(q)}^{i|j}$, and $(j|k)$ is defined similarly. Let now $v_\ell \in I$ be a map whose image contains $v_i(p)$, $v_j(q)$, and $v_k(r)$, which is possible since $m \geq 3$. We have that $(h(v_{i|j}), h(v_\ell))$ satisfies the necessary compatibility conditions and so does $(h(v_{j|k}), h(v_\ell))$, so that we must have $g_{v_\ell^{-1}v_i(p)}^\ell = g_{v_\ell^{-1}v_j(q)}^\ell$ and $g_{v_\ell^{-1}v_j(q)}^\ell = g_{v_\ell^{-1}v_k(r)}^\ell$. In particular, $g_{v_\ell^{-1}v_i(p)}^\ell = g_{v_\ell^{-1}v_k(r)}^\ell$ and $g_p^i \sim g_r^k$. Consider the structure $\mathbb{C}$ defined on the set of $\sim$ -equivalence classes and where $R(a_1/\sim, \dots, a_r/\sim)$ is true in $\mathbb{C}$ iff there is $b_1, \dots, b_r$ in some $\mathbb{C}_p$ such that $a_i \sim b_i$ for all i and such that $R(b_1, \dots, b_r)$ is true in $\mathbb{C}_p$. This structure embeds into $\mathbb{B}$. Indeed, it suffices to prove that if $\mathbb{D}$ is a bound for $\mathbb{B}$, then $\mathbb{D}$ does not embed into $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose for contradiction that it does: since $\mathbb{D}$ has size at most $m_b \leq m$, we would have that $\mathbb{D}$ embeds into $\mathbb{C}_p$ for some p . Since $\mathbb{C}_p$ is a substructure of $\mathbb{B}$, we would obtain an embedding of $\mathbb{D}$ into $\mathbb{B}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathbb{C}$ embeds into $\mathbb{B}$ via e , and we let $f: [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ be the map defined as follows. For $p \in [n]$, let $v_i \in I$ be any map whose range contains p . There is a structure $\mathbb{C}_i$ associated with v_i , and an element $g_{v_i^{-1}(p)}^i$ in $\mathbb{C}_i$. Let $f(p) := e(g_{v_i^{-1}(p)}^i/\sim)$. Note that by the construction of $\sim$, if $\mathbb{C}_i$ and $\mathbb{C}_j$ both have p in their image,

then $g_{v_i^{-1}(p)}^i \sim g_{v_j^{-1}(p)}^j$, so the particular choice of i does not matter. Note also that if $g_{v_i^{-1}(p)}^i \neq g_{v_i^{-1}(q)}^i$, then $g_{v_i^{-1}(p)}^i \not\sim g_{v_i^{-1}(q)}^i$, and therefore $f(p) \neq f(q)$.

We finally prove that $(f(1), \dots, f(n))$ satisfies Ψ in $\mathbb{A}$. Let $j: [r] \rightarrow [n]$ and $R(x_{j(1)}, \dots, x_{j(r)})$ be a conjunct from Ψ , and let $\chi(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ be the qf-formula that defines R in $\mathbb{B}$. Let $v_i \in I$ be such that $\text{Im}(j) \subseteq \text{Im}(v_i)$. The tuple $(g_1^i, \dots, g_m^i)$ has the qf-type $h(v_i)$ in $\mathbb{B}$. Let U be the unary relation symbol of $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$ that denotes $\langle \chi(z_{v_i^{-1}j(1)}, \dots, z_{v_i^{-1}j(r)}) \rangle$. By construction, the formula Φ contains the conjunct $U(v_i)$. Since h satisfies Φ , $h(v_i)$ must contain $\chi(z_{v_i^{-1}j(1)}, \dots, z_{v_i^{-1}j(r)})$. We obtain that $\mathbb{B} \models \chi(g_{v_i^{-1}j(1)}^i, \dots, g_{v_i^{-1}j(r)}^i)$. The function that maps $(g_{v_i^{-1}j(1)}^i, \dots, g_{v_i^{-1}j(r)}^i)$ to $(f(j(1)), \dots, f(j(r)))$ is a partial isomorphism of $\mathbb{B}$, so $\mathbb{B} \models \chi(f(j(1)), \dots, f(j(r)))$, i.e., the constraint $R(x_{j(1)}, \dots, x_{j(r)})$ is satisfied by f .

The given reduction can be performed in polynomial time: the number of variables in the new instance is in $O(n^m)$, and if c is the number of constraints in Ψ , then the number of constraints in Φ is in $O(cn^m + n^{2m})$. Each of the new constraints can be constructed in constant time. $\square$

We mention that the reduction is in fact a *first-order reduction* (see [1] for a definition).

Example 1. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be $(\mathbb{N}; =, \neq)$. We illustrate the reduction in the proof of Theorem 3 with the concrete instance

$$x_1 = x_2 \wedge x_2 = x_3 \wedge x_3 = x_4 \wedge x_1 \neq x_4.$$

of $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$. The structure $(\mathbb{N}; =, \neq)$ is a reduct of the homogeneous structure with domain $\mathbb{N}$ and the empty signature, which has no bounds. We have in this example $m = 3$.

The structure $T_{\mathbb{B},3}(\mathbb{A})$ has a domain of size five, the unary relation U_1 for $\langle z_2 = z_3 \rangle$, U_2 for $\langle z_1 = z_3 \rangle$, U_3 for $\langle z_1 = z_2 \rangle$, V_1 for $\langle z_2 \neq z_3 \rangle$, V_2 for $\langle z_1 \neq z_3 \rangle$, and V_3 for $\langle z_1 \neq z_2 \rangle$. The instance Φ of $\text{CSP}(T_{\mathbb{B},3}(\mathbb{A}))$ that our reduction creates has four variables, for the four order-preserving injections from $[3] \rightarrow [4]$, called v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 , where $\text{Im}(v_j) = [4] \setminus \{j\}$. We then have the following constraints in Φ :

- $U_3(v_3)$ and $U_3(v_4)$ for the constraint $x_1 = x_2$ in Ψ ;
- $U_1(v_4)$ and $U_3(v_1)$ for the constraint $x_2 = x_3$ in Ψ ;
- $U_1(v_2)$ and $U_1(v_1)$ for the constraint $x_3 = x_4$ in Ψ ;
- $V_2(v_2)$ and $V_2(v_3)$ for the constraint $x_1 \neq x_4$ in Ψ .

For the compatibility constraints we only give an example. Let $k, k': [2] \rightarrow [4]$ be such that $k(1, 2) = (1, 3)$ and $k'(1, 2) = (1, 2)$. Then $\text{Comp}_{k,k'}(v_4, v_2)$ and $\text{Comp}_{k',k'}(v_4, v_3)$ are in Φ . $\square$

We mention that Theorem 3 applies to all CSPs that can be described in SNP (for SNP in connection to CSPs see, e.g., [27]). The question when this reduction is in fact an equivalence is addressed in Section 4.

4 New abstract tractability conditions

We first recall basics from universal algebra that are needed to formulate the algebraic facts for finite-domain constraint satisfaction that are relevant for the purposes of this paper, collected in Theorem 4. We then briefly introduce fundamental concepts for infinite-domain constraint satisfaction, and can finally state and prove our new tractability conditions.

Universal Algebra

An *algebra* is a structure whose signature contains only function symbols, whose interpretations are then called the (*fundamental*) *operations* of the algebra. Functions that are obtained as compositions of fundamental operations are called the *term operations*. A substructure of an algebra is referred to as a *subalgebra*. An *idempotent algebra* is an algebra whose operations are *idempotent*, i.e., they satisfy the law $f^{\mathbf{A}}(x, \dots, x) = x$ for all $x \in A$. If $\mathbf{A}$ is an algebra and n is a positive integer, $\mathbf{A}^n$ is defined as the algebra on A^n where for each k -ary function f in the signature of $\mathbf{A}$, $f^{\mathbf{A}^n}$ is the function $(A^n)^k \rightarrow A^n$ obtained by applying $f^{\mathbf{A}}$ on tuples componentwise. Given an algebra $\mathbf{A}$, we write $\text{HSP}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbf{A})$ for the class of algebras that contains an algebra $\mathbf{T}$ iff there is a positive integer n , a subalgebra $\mathbf{S}$ of $\mathbf{A}^n$, and a surjective homomorphism $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$. The class $\text{HS}(\mathbf{A})$ is defined similarly, where we only allow $n = 1$.

Clones

A set $\mathcal{C}$ of functions over a set D is called a *function clone* if for all $k \geq 1$ and all $1 \leq i \leq k$ it contains the *projections* $\pi_i^k: (x_1, \dots, x_k) \rightarrow x_i$, and if $\mathcal{C}$ is closed under composition of functions. The smallest function clone on $\{0, 1\}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{P}$. A typical function clone is the set $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ of term operations of an algebra $\mathbf{A}$, and indeed for every function clone $\mathcal{C}$ there exists an algebra $\mathbf{A}$ such that $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$. A *clone homomorphism* between two clones $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a function $\xi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $\xi(\pi_i^k) = \pi_i^k$ and

$$\xi(f \circ (g_1, \dots, g_k)) = \xi(f) \circ (\xi(g_1), \dots, \xi(g_k))$$

holds for all $f, g_1, \dots, g_k \in \mathcal{C}$. The *stabilizer* of a clone $\mathcal{C}$ by a constant c , written $\mathcal{C}_c$, is the subclone of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of all the functions f such that $f(c, \dots, c) = c$.

A function of arity $k \geq 2$ is a *weak near-unanimity* [37] if it satisfies the equations

$$f(y, x, \dots, x) = f(x, y, x, \dots, x) = \dots = f(x, \dots, x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in A$. An operation f of arity $k \geq 2$ is said to be *cyclic* (see [3]) if it satisfies $f(\bar{x}) = f(\sigma \bar{x})$ for every $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$, where σ maps $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ to $(x_2, \dots, x_k, x_1)$. A 6-ary function $f: A^6 \rightarrow A$ is *Siggers* (see [39]) if it satisfies $f(x, y, x, z, y, z) = f(y, x, z, x, z, y)$ for all $x, y, z \in A$. The following is a combination of several results, old and new.

Theorem 4. *For finite idempotent algebras $\mathbf{A}$, 1.-6. are equivalent.*

1. *There is no clone homomorphism from $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ to $\mathcal{P}$;*
2. *$\text{HSP}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbf{A})$ does not contain a 2-element algebra all of whose operations are projections [7];*
3. *$\text{HS}(\mathbf{A})$ does not contain a 2-element algebra all of whose operations are projections (Proposition 4.14 from [25]);*
4. *$\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ contains a weak near-unanimity operation [37];*
5. *$\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ contains a cyclic operation [3];*
6. *$\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ contains a Siggers operation [39].*

For not necessarily idempotent finite algebras, this theorem fails in general, but items 4, 5, 6 are still equivalent (see [5]). Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a relational structure with finite domain and finite signature, and let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra such that $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) = \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$. Then the *tractability conjecture* for finite-domain CSPs states that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P if and only if $\mathbf{A}$ satisfies item 4, 5, or 6 in Theorem 4.

The Topology of Pointwise Convergence

To study potential analogs of Theorem 4 for algebras on infinite domains, topological concepts become important. A function clone comes naturally equipped with a topology, namely the topology of pointwise convergence where D is a discrete space. This topology is characterised by the fact that a sequence $(f_i)_{i \in \omega}$ converges to f if, and only if, for every finite subset S of D there exists an $i_0 \in \omega$ such that for all $i \geq i_0$, we have that f_i and f coincide on S . Given a relational structure $\mathbb{A}$, the set $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ is a function clone over A which is topologically closed in the full clone over A (the clone consisting of all the functions of finite arity over A).

Let f, g be operations over D and let U be a subset of $\text{Sym}(D)$. When the topological closure of $\{\alpha \circ f \circ (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \mid \alpha, \beta_i \in U\}$ contains g , we say that g is *interpolated by f modulo U* .

Homogeneity

A structure $\mathbb{A}$ is said to be *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between finite substructures of $\mathbb{A}$ can be extended to an automorphism of $\mathbb{A}$. Examples of homogeneous structures are $(\mathbb{N}; =)$ and $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$. Reducts of homogeneous structures with finite relational signature are examples of ω -categorical structures: a structure $\mathbb{A}$ is ω -categorical if for every positive integer m , the natural action of $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$ on A^m has finitely many orbits.

Proposition 5. *Suppose that $\mathbb{A}$ is a finitely bounded homogeneous structure. Any expansion of $\mathbb{A}$ by finitely many relations of the form $\{c\}$ for $c \in A$ is a reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure, too.*

Proof. Let τ be the signature of $\mathbb{A}$. The structure $(\mathbb{A}; c^{\mathbb{A}})$ is clearly homogeneous. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the finite set of bounds of $\mathbb{A}$, and let n be the maximal size of the structures in $\mathcal{G}$. Define $\mathcal{F}'$ to be the set of $(\tau \cup \{c\})$ -structures on $n+1$ elements whose τ -reduct embeds some structure in $\mathcal{G}$. Let $\mathbb{A}_c$ be the structure generated by $c^{\mathbb{A}}$ in $\mathbb{A}$; note that $\mathbb{A}_c$ is finite. We write $\mathcal{F}$ for the union of $\mathcal{F}'$ with the set of $(\tau \cup \{c\})$ -structures of size $|\mathbb{A}_c|$ that are not isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_c$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}$ contains only finitely many structures up to isomorphism. To show that $(\mathbb{A}; c^{\mathbb{A}})$ is finitely bounded, it therefore suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}$ contains the bounds of $(\mathbb{A}; c^{\mathbb{A}})$.

We first show that no structure in $\mathcal{F}$ embeds into $(\mathbb{A}; c^{\mathbb{A}})$. This is obvious for the $(\tau \cup \{c\})$ -structures in $\mathcal{F}$ of size $|\mathbb{A}|_c$ that are not isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_c$. Now suppose for contradiction that there is an embedding e of $(\mathbb{F}, c^{\mathbb{F}}) \in \mathcal{F}'$ into $(\mathbb{A}, c^{\mathbb{A}})$. By definition of $\mathcal{F}'$, the structure $\mathbb{F}$ embeds some $\mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{G}$. By composing the embeddings, we obtain an embedding of $\mathbb{G}$ into $\mathbb{A}$, a contradiction to the choice of $\mathcal{G}$.

Let $(\mathbb{B}, c^{\mathbb{B}})$ be a $(\tau \cup \{c\})$ -structure such that no structure from $\mathcal{F}$ embeds into $(\mathbb{B}, c^{\mathbb{B}})$. We have to show that $(\mathbb{B}, c^{\mathbb{B}})$ embeds into $(\mathbb{A}, c^{\mathbb{A}})$. Since no structure from $\mathcal{F}'$ embeds into $(\mathbb{B}, c^{\mathbb{B}})$, no $\mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{G}$ embeds into $\mathbb{B}$. Hence, by the definition of $\mathcal{G}$, there exists an embedding e of $\mathbb{B}$ into $\mathbb{A}$. Moreover, the structure generated by $c^{\mathbb{B}}$ in $\mathbb{B}$ must be isomorphic to the structure generated by $c^{\mathbb{A}}$ in $\mathbb{A}$. By the homogeneity of $\mathbb{A}$ there exists an automorphism α of $\mathbb{A}$ that maps $e(c^{\mathbb{B}})$ to $c^{\mathbb{A}}$. It follows that $\alpha \circ e$ is an embedding of $\mathbb{B}$ into $\mathbb{A}$ that maps $c^{\mathbb{B}}$ to $c^{\mathbb{A}}$, i.e., $\alpha \circ e$ is an embedding of $(\mathbb{B}, c^{\mathbb{B}})$ into $(\mathbb{A}, c^{\mathbb{A}})$. $\square$

Siggers operations modulo unary operations

Another important question when generalising Theorem 4 to infinite domains is how to replace the last three items involving weak near-unanimity operations, cyclic operations, and Siggers operations. Given two unary operations e_1, e_2 , we say that a function is *Siggers modulo e_1, e_2* if for all x, y, z in A , we have $e_1(f(x, y, x, z, y, z)) = e_2(f(y, x, z, x, z, y))$. *Weak near-unanimity operations modulo $e_1, \dots, e_k$* and *cyclic operations modulo e_1, e_2* are defined similarly. A recent breakthrough by Barto and Pinsker [6] gives the following dichotomy:

Theorem 6 (Theorem 1.4 in [6]). *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a clone whose invertible elements form an oligomorphic group which is dense in the unary part of $\mathcal{C}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- *For all $c_1, \dots, c_k$, there is no continuous clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{C}_{c_1, \dots, c_k}$ to $\mathcal{P}$,*
- *There exists a Siggers operation in $\mathcal{C}$ modulo unary operations of $\mathcal{C}$.*

Canonical Functions

Let $f: A^k \rightarrow A$, and let $\mathbb{A}$ be a relational structure on A . We say that f is *canonical with respect to $\mathbb{A}$* if for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$ and all

m -tuples $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k$, there exists $\beta \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $\beta f(\alpha_1 \bar{a}_1, \dots, \alpha_k \bar{a}_k) = f(\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k)$. Equivalently, this means that f induces a function $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ on orbits of m -tuples under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$, by defining $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)(O_1, \dots, O_k)$ as the orbit of $f(\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k)$, where $\bar{a}_i$ is any m -tuple in O_i . Automorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$ are canonical functions with respect to $\mathbb{A}$, and so are the projections. We can also check that the composition of canonical functions is again canonical. Therefore, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a function clone that contains $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$, the set $\mathcal{D}$ of operations of $\mathcal{C}$ that are canonical with respect to $\mathbb{A}$ is again a function clone that contains $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$. For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the set that consists of the functions $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{D}$ is a function clone $\mathcal{D}_m^{\text{typ}}$ on the set of orbits of m -tuples. The application $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_m^{\text{typ}}$ is easily seen to be a continuous clone homomorphism. For a more detailed exposition of these functions, we refer the reader to Section 6 of [18]. We will several times use the following result, proved in [18].

Proposition 7 (Corollary of the proof of Proposition 6.6 in [18]). *Let Σ be a set of equations, and let $\mathbb{A}$ be an ω -categorical structure. Suppose that for every finite subset A' of A , and for every equation $s \approx t$ in Σ , there are $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$ and $s, t \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $\alpha s|_{A'} = t|_{A'}$. Then Σ is satisfiable in $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ modulo $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$.*

A corollary of Proposition 7 is the following (which is the original Proposition 6.6 in [18]). Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a homogeneous structure in a finite relational language of maximal arity m , let $\mathcal{D}$ be a closed clone of functions that are canonical with respect to $\mathbb{A}$ and such that $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$ is contained in $\mathcal{D}$, and let Σ be a set of equations. If Σ is satisfiable in $\mathcal{D}_m^{\text{typ}}$, then Σ is satisfiable in $\mathcal{D}$ modulo $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$.

Abstract Tractability Conditions

It is known that the complexity of $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ for ω -categorical structures $\mathbb{A}$ only depends on the properties of the polymorphism clone of $\mathbb{A}$. These properties can be of different nature. *Abstract* properties are properties that can be expressed using only the composition symbol and quantification over the functions in the clone, e.g., “there exists a function f , such that $f \circ (\pi_2^2, \pi_1^2) = f$.” *Topological* properties are properties that can also refer to $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ as a topological object, e.g., “there exists a *continuous* clone homomorphism $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$.” Finally, *concrete properties* are properties that refer to certain concrete functions in the polymorphism clone. This distinction mirrors the distinction between abstract clones, topological clones, and function clones.

It was shown that for an ω -categorical structure $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$, the complexity of $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ only depends on topological properties of $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ [17]. However, most of the known conditions that imply that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P are *concrete* conditions. One notable exception is tractability from *quasi near unanimity polymorphisms*, that is, polymorphisms that satisfy the identity

$$\begin{aligned} f(y, x, \dots, x) &= f(x, y, x, \dots, x) = \dots \\ &= f(x, \dots, x, y) = f(x, \dots, x). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{A}$ has a quasi near unanimity polymorphism then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P [10]. This tractability condition is an abstract condition (it can be rewritten using only f , the projection operations π_1^2, π_2^2 , and the composition symbol). The tractability conditions that we are able to lift from the finite as below are all of the abstract type.

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a reduct of a finitely bounded structure $\mathbb{B}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The following lemma connects the polymorphism clone of a structure $\mathbb{A}$ with the polymorphism clone of its associated type structure $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathbb{B}$ be a homogeneous relational structure, and let $\mathbb{A}$ be a qf-reduct of $\mathbb{B}$. If f is a polymorphism of $\mathbb{A}$ which is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{B}$, then $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ is a polymorphism of $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$.*

Proof. Let k be the arity of f , let $i: [r] \rightarrow [m]$, and let $p_1, \dots, p_k$ be types in $\langle \chi(z_{i(1)}, \dots, z_{i(r)}) \rangle$. Let $\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^k$ be m -tuples whose types are $p_1, \dots, p_k$ respectively. Since $\mathbb{B}$ is homogeneous in a finite relational language, we have that orbits of m -tuples under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{B})$ and qf-types are in one-to-one correspondence, so that $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ can be seen as a function on m -types. We have that $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)(p_1, \dots, p_k)$ is the type of $f(\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^k)$ in $\mathbb{B}$. Since f preserves the relation defined by $\chi(z_{i(1)}, \dots, z_{i(r)})$, it follows that $f(\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^k)$ satisfies $\chi(z_{i(1)}, \dots, z_{i(r)})$, which means that $\chi(z_{i(1)}, \dots, z_{i(r)})$ is contained in the type of this tuple, and therefore $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ preserves the relations of the first sort.

We now prove that the relations of the second sort in $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$ are preserved by $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ for any function f which is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{B}$. Indeed, let $(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_k, q_k)$ be pairs of types in $\text{Comp}_{i,j}$. Let $(\bar{a}^1, \bar{b}^1), \dots, (\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k)$ be pairs of m -tuples such that $\text{tp}(\bar{a}^l) = p_l$ and $\text{tp}(\bar{b}^l) = q_l$ for all $l \in [k]$. As noted above, the definition of $\text{Comp}_{i,j}$ implies that the tuples $(a_{i(1)}^l, \dots, a_{i(r)}^l)$ and $(b_{j(1)}^l, \dots, b_{j(r)}^l)$ have the same type in $\mathbb{B}$ for all $l \in [k]$. Since f is canonical, we have that $(f(a_{i(1)}^1, \dots, a_{i(1)}^k), \dots, f(a_{i(r)}^1, \dots, a_{i(r)}^k))$ has the same type as $(f(b_{j(1)}^1, \dots, b_{j(1)}^k), \dots, f(b_{j(r)}^1, \dots, b_{j(r)}^k))$ in $\mathbb{B}$. This implies that

$$\text{Comp}_{i,j}(\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)(p_1, \dots, p_k), \xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)(q_1, \dots, q_k))$$

holds, which concludes the proof. $\square$

One of the main results of this paper, Theorem 3, yields a series of new abstract tractability conditions: for every known abstract tractability condition for finite domain CSPs, we obtain an abstract tractability condition for reducts of finitely bounded homogeneous structures $\mathbb{B}$. To demonstrate this, we first observe that the functions on A that are canonical with respect to $\mathbb{A}$ can be characterised algebraically.

Proposition 9. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a homogeneous structure with a finite relational language such that $\overline{\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})} = \text{End}(\mathbb{A})$. Let $f: A^n \rightarrow A$. Then f is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{A}$ if and only if for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \text{End}(\mathbb{A})$ there exist $e_1, e_2 \in \text{End}(\mathbb{A})$ such that*

$$e_1 \circ f \circ (a_1, \dots, a_n) = e_1 \circ f.$$

Proof. The “if” direction is clear. In the other direction, the assumption that f is canonical gives that for every finite subset of A , the equation $f \circ (a_1, \dots, a_n) \approx f$ is satisfiable modulo $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$. By Proposition 7, this means that this equation is satisfiable modulo $\overline{\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})} = \text{End}(\mathbb{A})$, that is, there exist $e_1, e_2 \in \text{End}(\mathbb{A})$ such that $e_1 \circ f \circ (a_1, \dots, a_n) = e_2 \circ f$. $\square$

Proposition 9 implies that the following is essentially an abstract tractability condition.

Theorem 10. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite-signature reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}) = \text{End}(\mathbb{A})$. Suppose that $\mathbb{A}$ has a four-ary polymorphism f and a ternary polymorphism g that are canonical with respect to $\mathbb{A}$, that are weak near-unanimity operations modulo $\text{End}(\mathbb{A})$, and such that there are operations e_1, e_2 in $\text{End}(\mathbb{A})$ with $e_1(f(y, x, x, x)) = e_2(g(y, x, x))$ for all x, y . Then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P.*

Proof. Let m be as in Section 3. By Lemma 8, $f' := \xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ and $g' := \xi_m^{\text{typ}}(g)$ are polymorphisms of $T_{\mathbb{B}, m}(\mathbb{A})$. Moreover, f' and g' must be weak near-unanimity operations, and they satisfy $f'(y, x, x, x) = g'(y, x, x)$. It follows from [35] in combination with [2] that $T_{\mathbb{B}, m}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P (it can be solved by a Datalog program). Theorem 3 then implies that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P, too. $\square$

Note that since the reduction from $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ to $\text{CSP}(T_{\mathbb{B}, m}(\mathbb{A}))$ presented in Section 3 is a first-order reduction, it is computable in Datalog. In particular, the hypotheses of Theorem 10 imply that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in Datalog. This result generalises many algorithmic results from the literature, for instance

- the polynomial-time tractable fragments of RCC-5 [31];
- the two polynomial-time algorithms for partially-ordered time from [23];
- polynomial-time tractable equality constraints [12];
- all polynomial-time tractable equivalence CSPs [20].

In all cases, the respective structures $\mathbb{A}$ have a polymorphism f such that $\xi_2^{\text{typ}}(f)$ is a semilattice operation [30]. Finite structures with a semilattice polymorphism also have weak near-unanimity polymorphisms f' and g' that satisfy $f'(y, x, x, x) = g'(y, x, x)$ (see [35]), and hence $\mathbb{A}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 10.

In the same way as in Theorem 10 every abstract tractability result for finite-domain CSPs can be lifted to an abstract tractability condition for ω -categorical CSPs. Note that the polynomial-time tractable cases in the recent classification for Graph-SAT problems [16] can also be explained with the help of Corollary 11 below, assuming the finite-domain tractability conjecture. Finally, we mention that the non-trivial polynomial-time tractable cases for reducts of $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$ provide examples that cannot be lifted from finite-domain tractability results in this way, since the respective languages do not have non-trivial *canonical* polymorphisms.

Corollary 11. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite-signature reduct of a finitely bounded homogeneous structure $\mathbb{B}$, and suppose that $\mathbb{A}$ has a Siggers (or weak nu) polymorphism f modulo operations from $\overline{\text{Aut}(\mathbb{B})}$ such that f is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{B}$. Then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P, unless the finite-domain tractability conjecture is false.*

Proof. By Lemma 8, $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ is a polymorphism of $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A})$. Since $\xi_m^{\text{typ}}(f)$ is a Siggers operation, the tractability conjecture implies that $\text{CSP}(T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{A}))$ is in P. Then Theorem 3 implies that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P. $\square$

5 Mashups

In this section we study finite-signature reducts of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, 2, \dots)$ and prove Theorem 2 stated in the introduction. Our main result is Theorem 12 which immediately implies Theorem 2.

Theorem 12. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, \dots, n-1)$ such that $\text{End}(\mathbb{A})$ is the set of injections that preserve $0, 1, \dots, n-1$. Let $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A})$ be the clone of polymorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$ that are canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *there is no continuous clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A})$ to $\mathcal{P}$;*
2. *for every $c_1, \dots, c_k$, there is no continuous clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})_{c_1, \dots, c_k}$ to $\mathcal{P}$;*
3. *$\mathbb{A}$ has a cyclic (Siggers, weak near-unanimity) polymorphism modulo endomorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$;*
4. *$\mathbb{A}$ has a cyclic (Siggers, weak near-unanimity) polymorphism f modulo endomorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$ and f is canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, \dots, n-1)$;*

The implication from 1 to 4 is a direct consequence of Proposition 7. 4 trivially implies 3, and the implication from 3 to 2 is immediate. The proof of the implication from 2 to 1 is more involved, and we outline our strategy now. By contraposition, we need to prove that if there is a continuous clone homomorphism ξ from $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A})$ to $\mathcal{P}$, there are constants $c_1, \dots, c_k$ and a continuous clone homomorphism ϕ from $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})_{c_1, \dots, c_k}$ to $\mathcal{P}$. In the first subsection below, we consider the clone homomorphisms that can be factored as $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ is the function clone induced by the action of $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A})$ on 1-types. Using the new concept of *mashups* of canonical functions, we show that these homomorphisms can be used to give a continuous clone homomorphism $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})_{c_1, \dots, c_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. The second type of homomorphisms we consider are those that factor as $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}) \rightarrow \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})_{\neq} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, where $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})_{\neq}$ is the clone induced by the action of $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ on the infinite orbit. In the second subsection, we prove that a homomorphism of one of the two types above must exist, which allows us to conclude the proof of the theorem.

5.1 Obtaining clone homomorphisms to the projections

From now on, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a fixed natural number. We write G_n for the group $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$ of permutations that pointwise fix the integers $0, \dots, n-1$. If $F \subset \mathbb{N}^k$ we write $G_n F$ for the set $\{\alpha \circ f \mid \alpha \in G_n\}$ and $F G_n$ for $\{f \circ (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \mid \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k \in G_n\}$.

Definition 1. Let k be a positive integer, and let g and h be two k -ary operations over $\{0, \dots, n\}$. Suppose that $g|_{\{0, \dots, n-1\}} = h|_{\{0, \dots, n-1\}}$. For $\ell \in [k]$, a function ω is an ℓ -mashup of g and h if it is such that:

$$\omega(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} g(x_1, \dots, x_k) & \text{if } x_\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \\ h(x_1, \dots, x_k) & \text{if for all } \ell' \neq \ell, x_{\ell'} \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 13. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an idempotent algebra over $\{0, \dots, n\}$. Suppose that there is a 2-element algebra in $\text{HS}(\mathbf{A})$ all of whose operations are projections. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a subalgebra of $\mathbf{A}$ and $f: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$ be a surjective homomorphism such that $\mathbf{T}$ is a 2-element algebra that contains only projections. Let $g^{\mathbf{A}}, h^{\mathbf{A}}$ be operations of $\mathbf{A}$ of arity k . If for all $\ell \in [k]$, an ℓ -mashup of $g^{\mathbf{A}}$ and $h^{\mathbf{A}}$ is an operation of $\mathbf{A}$, then $g^{\mathbf{T}} = h^{\mathbf{T}}$.

Proof. The algebra $\mathbf{T}$ has two elements a, b . Without loss of generality $n \notin f^{-1}(a)$. Let $m \in f^{-1}(a)$ and $m' \in f^{-1}(b)$. Let ℓ be such that $g^{\mathbf{T}}$ is the ℓ -th projection. Let $\omega^{\mathbf{A}}$ be an ℓ -mashup of $g^{\mathbf{A}}$ and $h^{\mathbf{A}}$. Let $\bar{t}_j$ be the tuple whose entries are a , except for the j -th one which is b . Then we have for $j \neq \ell$:

$$\omega^{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{t}_j) = f(\omega^{\mathbf{A}}(m, \dots, m, m', m, \dots, m)) \quad (1)$$

$$= f(g^{\mathbf{A}}(m, \dots, m, m', m, \dots, m)) \quad (2)$$

$$= g^{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{t}_j) = a. \quad (3)$$

where (1) holds because $\bar{t}_j$ is the image under f of the tuple whose entries are m except for the j -th one which is m' . Since $j \neq \ell$, the ℓ -th entry of this tuple is $m \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, so that $\omega^{\mathbf{A}}(m, \dots, m, m', m, \dots, m) = g^{\mathbf{A}}(m, \dots, m, m', m, \dots, m)$ which gives the equation (2). By assumption, $g^{\mathbf{T}}$ is the ℓ -th projection, which gives the last equality. Thus, $\omega^{\mathbf{T}}$ is not the j -th projection, for any $j \neq \ell$, and it is therefore the ℓ -th projection.

We now apply the same reasoning with $j = \ell$. This time, we obtain that $\omega^{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{t}_\ell) = h^{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{t}_\ell)$, and since we know that $\omega^{\mathbf{T}}$ is the ℓ -th projection, we obtain that $h^{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{t}_\ell) = b$. This finally implies that $h^{\mathbf{T}}$ is the ℓ -th projection, so that $g^{\mathbf{T}} = h^{\mathbf{T}}$. $\square$

Corollary 14. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an idempotent algebra over $\{0, \dots, n\}$, and suppose that there exists a clone homomorphism $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. Then there exists a clone homomorphism $\xi: \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ such that for every g and h in $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$, if all the mashups of g and h are in $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$, we have $\xi(g) = \xi(h)$.

Proof. By the hypothesis and Theorem 4, there exists an algebra in $\text{HS}(\mathbf{A})$ whose operations are projections. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a subalgebra of $\mathbf{A}$ and $f: \mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$ be a homomorphism onto an algebra whose operations are projections. Define ξ to be the map that takes a term operation $t^{\mathbf{A}}$ in $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ to $t^{\mathbf{T}}$. Lemma 13 then implies that ξ satisfies the required property. $\square$

When using Corollary 14, the finite algebra we consider is the algebra whose domain is the set of orbits of $\mathbb{N}$ under G_n , and whose operations are induced by the functions that are canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$. In order to prove that the mashup of two functions exists in this algebra, we therefore need to prove that there exists a canonical function which induces this mashup. This motivates the following definition and propositions.

Definition 2. Let $g, h, \omega: \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, let $\ell \in [k]$, and let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. We say that ω is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g and h iff the following holds: there exist $\alpha, \beta \in G_n$ such that for all $x_1, \dots, x_k \in S$, we have

$$\omega(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} \alpha g(x_1, \dots, x_k) & \text{if } x_\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \\ \beta h(x_1, \dots, x_k) & \text{if for all } \ell' \neq \ell, x_{\ell'} \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 15 (Canonisation lemma). *Every $f: \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ interpolates modulo G_n a function $g: \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that is canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$.*

Proof. Let $\prec$ be any linear order on $\mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \prec \dots \prec n-1 \prec m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and such that $\prec$ is dense on $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. The structure $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$ is an ω -categorical ordered Ramsey structure. It follows from [19] that there exists a g which satisfies the conclusion of the lemma, except that g is canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$. We prove that g is also canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$. It is known that it suffices to check that for all pairs $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_k, b_k), (c_1, d_1), \dots, (c_k, d_k)$ such that (a_i, b_i) is in the same orbit as (c_i, d_i) for all $i \in [k]$, we have that $(g(\bar{a}), g(\bar{b}))$ and $(g(\bar{c}), g(\bar{d}))$ are in the same orbit under G_n . Note that G_n satisfies the following property:

- (†) two pairs $(a, b), (c, d)$ are in the same orbit under G_n iff a, c are in the same orbit, b, d are in the same orbit and $a = b$ iff $c = d$.

We first prove that $g(\bar{a})$ and $g(\bar{c})$ are in the same orbit under G_n . Using the property above, we know that a_i and c_i are in the same orbit under G_n . It follows that they are in the same orbit under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$: either $a_i = c_i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and they are in the same orbit, or a_i and c_i are both different from $0, \dots, n-1$ and in this case they both lie in the unique infinite orbit under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$. Since g is known to be canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$, we have that $g(\bar{a})$ and $g(\bar{c})$ are in the same orbit under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$, and therefore they are in the same orbit under G_n . Similarly we obtain that $g(\bar{b})$ and $g(\bar{d})$ are in the same orbit under G_n .

Therefore, it remains to check that $g(\bar{a})$ is equal to $g(\bar{b})$ iff $g(\bar{c})$ equals $g(\bar{d})$. Suppose that $g(\bar{a}) = g(\bar{b})$. If $g(\bar{a})$ is among $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$, then by the paragraph

above we immediately obtain $g(\bar{c}) = g(\bar{a}) = g(\bar{b}) = g(\bar{d})$. Thus, assume that $g(\bar{a}), g(\bar{b}) \notin \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Let $e_i \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that either:

- $a_i \prec b_i$ and e_i is taken to be larger than c_i and d_i ,
- $b_i \prec a_i$ and e_i is taken to be smaller than c_i and d_i , or
- $a_i = b_i$ and $e_i = c_i$.

Note that if $a_i = b_i$ then $c_i = d_i$ so $e_i = c_i = d_i$. By definition, we have that (a_i, b_i) , (c_i, e_i) , and (d_i, e_i) all are in the same orbit under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$ for all $i \in [k]$. We therefore have that $(g(\bar{a}), g(\bar{b}))$, $(g(\bar{c}), g(\bar{e}))$, and $(g(\bar{d}), g(\bar{e}))$ are in the same orbit under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1, \prec)$, whence they are in the same orbit under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$. Thus, if $g(\bar{a}) = g(\bar{b})$ then $g(\bar{c}) = g(\bar{e})$ and $g(\bar{d}) = g(\bar{e})$. In particular, we have $g(\bar{c}) = g(\bar{d})$. $\square$

For the rest of this section, “ f is canonical” means “ f is canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$ ”.

Proposition 16. *Let $f: \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and let g and h be canonical and in $\overline{GfG}$. Let $\ell \in [k]$. Then there exists a canonical function ζ in $\overline{G_n f G_n}$ which is for every finite set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g and h .*

Proof. We first prove that for every finite subset S of $\mathbb{N}$, there exists in $G_n f G_n$ a function ω_S which is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g and h . Let $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ be finite. Since g and h are in $\overline{G_n f G_n}$, there exist functions $\alpha, \gamma, \beta_1, \delta_1, \dots, \beta_k, \delta_k$ in G_n such that

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_k \in S, g(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \gamma f(\delta_1 x_1, \dots, \delta_k x_k)$$

and

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_k \in S, h(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \alpha f(\beta_1 x_1, \dots, \beta_k x_k).$$

Define $\omega_S: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as

$$\omega_S(x_1, \dots, x_k) = f_i(\epsilon_1(x_1), \dots, \epsilon_k(x_k)),$$

where $\epsilon_\ell = \beta_\ell$, and $\epsilon_{\ell'} = \delta_{\ell'}$ if $\ell' \neq \ell$. Note that when $x \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, we have $\delta_{\ell'}(x) = \beta_{\ell'}(x) = x$ for every $\ell' \in [k]$. This immediately gives

$$\omega_S(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} \gamma^{-1}(g(x_1, \dots, x_k)) & \text{if } x_\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \\ \alpha^{-1}(h(x_1, \dots, x_k)) & \text{if for all } \ell' \neq \ell, x_{\ell'} \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\omega_S \in G_n f G_n$ is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g and h .

We now prove that there exists a single function which is an (ℓ, S) -mashup for all finite $S \subset \mathbb{N}$. For each positive integer $m \geq n-1$, consider the equivalence relation on functions $\{0, \dots, m\}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by $r \sim_m s$ iff there exists $\alpha \in G_n$ such that $r = \alpha \circ s$. Note that if r is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h and if $r \sim_m s$, then s is also an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h . For each $m \geq n-1$, this relation has finite index because the action of G_n on $\mathbb{N}$ is oligomorphic (that is, there are only finitely many orbits of k -tuples for every positive integer k). Consider

the following forest $\mathcal{F}$. For each $m \geq n-1$ and each function ω which is an $(\ell, \{0, \dots, m\})$ -mashup of g and h in $G_n\{f_i: i \in \mathbb{N}\}G_n$, the forest $\mathcal{F}$ contains the vertex $(\omega|_{\{0, \dots, m\}})/\sim_m$. For each $m \geq n$, if $r/\sim_m$ is a vertex of $\mathcal{F}$, then there is an edge $\{s/\sim_{m-1}, r/\sim_m\}$ where $s = r|_{\{0, \dots, m-1\}}$. By the first paragraph, there are infinitely many vertices in $\mathcal{F}$. Since $\sim_m$ has finite index for all $m \geq n-1$, the forest is finitely branching, and has finitely many roots. By König's lemma, there exists an infinite branch in $\mathcal{F}$, which we denote by $(\omega_m/\sim_m)_{m \geq n-1}$.

We now construct a chain of functions $\zeta_m: \{0, \dots, m\}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\zeta_m \subset \zeta_{m+1}$ for all $m \geq n-1$, and such that ζ_m is $\sim_m$ -equivalent to ω_m . For $m = n-1$, simply put $\zeta_m = \omega_m$. Suppose that $m > n-1$ and that ζ_{m-1} is defined. There is an edge between ω_{m-1} and ω_m by hypothesis and $\zeta_{m-1} \sim_{m-1} \omega_{m-1}$, which means that there is α in G_n such that $\alpha\omega_m|_{\{0, \dots, m-1\}} = \zeta_{m-1}$. Define ζ_m to be $\alpha\omega_m$. We have $\zeta_{m-1} = \zeta_m|_{\{0, \dots, m-1\}}$ and $\zeta_m \sim_m \omega_m$, as required. Let now $\zeta = \bigcup_{m \geq n-1} \zeta_m$. It remains to prove that ζ is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h for every finite $S \subset \mathbb{N}$. Let S be such a finite set, and m be such that $m \geq n-1$ and $m \geq \max(S)$. Since $\zeta_m \sim_m \omega_m$ and ω_m is an $(\ell, \{0, \dots, m\})$ -mashup of g, h , so is ζ_m . Finally, since $\zeta_m = \zeta|_{\{0, \dots, m\}}$, we have that ζ is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h for every finite S . Let ζ' be canonical and obtained from ζ by Lemma 15. It is immediate that ζ' is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h for every finite S . Moreover, ζ' is in $\overline{G_n \zeta G_n}$ and we have

$$\overline{G_n \zeta G_n} \subseteq \overline{G_n \{\omega_m: m \geq n-1\} G_n} \subseteq \overline{G_n f G_n},$$

so that ζ' is in $\overline{G_n f G_n}$ as required. $\square$

The orbit of an element m in $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ is $\{m\}$ and can be interpreted as m itself, and the orbit of an element in $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ is exactly $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and in the following will be associated with n .

Proposition 17 (Building Mashups). *Let g, h be canonical functions of arity k and let $\ell \in [k]$. Suppose that ω is canonical and is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h for every finite $S \subset \mathbb{N}$. Then $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(\omega)$ is an ℓ -mashup of $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(g)$ and $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(h)$.*

Proof. Let $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $x_\ell \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and let y_i be the orbit of x_i under G_n . Then $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(\omega)(y_1, \dots, y_k)$ is by definition the orbit of $\omega(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Since ω is by assumption an $(\ell, \{x_1, \dots, x_k\})$ -mashup there exists an $\alpha \in G_n$ such that $\omega(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \alpha g(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Hence, $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(\omega)(y_1, \dots, y_k) = \xi_1^{\text{typ}}(g)(y_1, \dots, y_k)$. The proof for the case that $x_{\ell'} \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ for all $\ell' \neq \ell$ is similar. $\square$

Theorem 18. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a closed function clone over $\mathbb{N}$ such that G_n is dense in $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}$. Suppose that there exists a clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ to $\mathcal{P}$. Then there exist finitely many constants $c_1, \dots, c_k$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{c_1, \dots, c_k}$ admits a continuous clone homomorphism to $\mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. By Corollary 14, there exists a clone homomorphism $\xi': \mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ such that any two functions of $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ which have all their mashups in $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ are mapped to the same projection in $\mathcal{P}$. By composition of ξ_1^{typ} with ξ' , we obtain

a continuous clone homomorphism $\xi: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. Define the extension ϕ of ξ to the whole clone $\mathcal{C}$ by setting $\phi(f) := \xi(g)$, where g is any canonical function that is interpolated by f modulo G_n . We claim that ϕ is well-defined, and that it is a *h1 homomorphism* [5]: a *h1 homomorphism* $\phi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is a map that satisfies, for every n -ary f in $\mathcal{C}$ and projections $\pi_{i_1}^k, \dots, \pi_{i_n}^k$, the identity

$$\phi(f \circ (\pi_{i_1}^k, \dots, \pi_{i_n}^k)) = \phi(f) \circ (\pi_{i_1}^k, \dots, \pi_{i_n}^k).$$

Furthermore, we prove that $\phi(e \circ f) = \phi(f)$ for every unary operation e in $\mathcal{C}$.

ϕ is well defined: let g, h be canonical and interpolated by f modulo G_n . Let $\ell \in [k]$. By applying Proposition 16, we obtain an operation ζ_ℓ which is canonical and interpolated by f modulo G_n and which is an (ℓ, S) -mashup of g, h for every finite $S \subset \mathbb{N}$. Then $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(\zeta_\ell) \in \mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ is an ℓ -mashup of $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(g)$ and $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(h)$ by Proposition 17. Since this holds for all $\ell \in [k]$ we therefore have $\xi'(\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(g)) = \xi'(\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(h))$, i.e., $\xi(g) = \xi(h)$ and ϕ is well defined.

ϕ preserves left-composition with unary operations: let e be a unary operation in $\mathcal{C}$, and let $f \in \mathcal{C}$. Let g be canonical and interpolated by $e \circ f$ modulo G_n . Note that g is also interpolated by f modulo G_n , so that $\phi(f) = \xi(g) = \phi(e \circ f)$. Since the only unary operation in $\mathcal{P}$ is the identity operation, we finally have $\phi(e) \circ \phi(f) = \phi(f)$.

ϕ is an h1 clone homomorphism: we need to prove that

$$\phi(f \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m)) = \phi(f) \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{C}$ of arity $k \geq 1$ and every $m \geq 1$. Let $g: \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be canonical and interpolated by f modulo G_n . Then $g \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m)$ is interpolated modulo G_n by $f \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m)$. So

$$\phi(f \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m)) = \xi(g \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m)) \quad (4)$$

$$= \xi(g) \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m) \quad (5)$$

$$= \phi(f) \circ (\pi_{i_1}^m, \dots, \pi_{i_k}^m) \quad (6)$$

where (4) and (6) hold by definition of ϕ , and (5) holds since ξ is a clone homomorphism.

Finally, the existence of ϕ implies the existence of a continuous clone homomorphism from some stabilizer of $\mathcal{C}$ by finitely many constants to $\mathcal{P}$. Indeed, Theorem 6 states that either there is a such clone homomorphism or there is a Siggers w in $\mathcal{C}$ modulo unary operations. In the second case, $\phi(w)$ would be a Siggers operation in $\mathcal{P}$: indeed, suppose that e_1, e_2 are such that

$$\forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}, e_1 w(x, y, x, z, y, z) = e_2 w(y, x, z, x, z, y).$$

This property can also be written in the language of clones as

$$e_1 \circ w \circ (\pi_1^3, \pi_2^3, \pi_1^3, \pi_3^3, \pi_2^3, \pi_3^3) = e_2 \circ w \circ (\pi_2^3, \pi_1^3, \pi_3^3, \pi_1^3, \pi_3^3, \pi_2^3).$$

Applying ϕ on both sides of the equation, we obtain

$$\phi(w) \circ (\pi_1^3, \pi_2^3, \pi_1^3, \pi_3^3, \pi_2^3, \pi_3^3) = \phi(w) \circ (\pi_2^3, \pi_1^3, \pi_3^3, \pi_1^3, \pi_3^3, \pi_2^3),$$

as ϕ is an h1 clone homomorphism. Whence, $\phi(w)$ is a Siggers operation in $\mathcal{P}$, a contradiction. So the first case of the dichotomy must apply, i.e., there are constants $c_1, \dots, c_k$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{c_1, \dots, c_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. $\square$

5.2 Obtaining Canonical Cyclic Polymorphisms

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a closed function clone over $\mathbb{N}$. When G_n is dense in $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}$, the map that takes $f \in \mathcal{C}$ to $f|_{\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}}$ is well-defined and a continuous clone homomorphism; the image of this clone homomorphism is a function clone $\mathcal{C}_\neq$ over the domain $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Clearly, every permutation of the domain of $\mathcal{C}_\neq$ is an operation in $\mathcal{C}_\neq$. Such clones have been studied in [12] in the context of constraint satisfaction problems. In particular, the authors show the following.

Theorem 19 (Consequence of Theorem 7 in [12]). *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a closed clone over a countably infinite set D containing $\text{Sym}(D)$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ has a continuous homomorphism to $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if there is no constant unary and no injective binary operation in $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proposition 20. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a closed clone over $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \overline{G_n}$. Suppose that neither $\mathcal{C}_\neq$ nor $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ has a continuous homomorphism to $\mathcal{P}$. Then $\mathcal{D}_2^{\text{typ}}$ contains a cyclic operation.*

Proof. Consider any algebra $\mathbf{A}$ such that $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$. Note that $\mathbf{A}$ is idempotent since $\mathcal{D}^{(1)} = \mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \overline{G_n}$. Since $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ does not have a homomorphism to $\mathcal{P}$, Theorem 4 implies that there exists an $f \in \mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ such that $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(f)$ is cyclic in $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$, of arity k . Since $\mathcal{C}_\neq$ does not have a homomorphism to $\mathcal{P}$, there exists by Theorem 19 a binary function $g' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that g' is injective when restricted to $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Indeed, $\mathcal{C}_\neq$ cannot contain a unary constant function, because $\overline{G_n} = \mathcal{C}^{(1)}$. Define

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_k) := g'(x_1, g'(x_2, \dots, g'(x_{k-1}, x_k) \dots))$$

which is an injection on $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and consider $f' \in \mathcal{D}$ defined by

$$f'(\bar{x}) := g(f(\bar{x}), f(\sigma\bar{x}), \dots, f(\sigma^{k-1}\bar{x})),$$

where σ is the permutation $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \mapsto (x_2, \dots, x_k, x_1)$. We claim that $\xi_2^{\text{typ}}(f') \in \mathcal{D}_2^{\text{typ}}$ is cyclic. It is trivial to check that $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(f')$ is cyclic in $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$.

We now show that for all k -tuples $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ such that $f'(\bar{a}) = f'(\bar{b})$ we have $f'(\sigma\bar{a}) = f'(\sigma\bar{b})$. Suppose that $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ are given and map to the same point under f' . This means that

$$\begin{aligned} & g(f(\bar{a}), f(\sigma\bar{a}), \dots, f(\sigma^{k-1}\bar{a})) \\ &= g(f(\bar{b}), f(\sigma\bar{b}), \dots, f(\sigma^{k-1}\bar{b})) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

If $f(\bar{a}) = m \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, then $f(\sigma^i(\bar{a})) = m$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ since f is cyclic in $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$, and therefore $f'(\bar{a}) = m = f'(\sigma\bar{a})$. This implies that $f'(\bar{b}) = m$ and $f'(\sigma\bar{b}) = m$ because f' is cyclic in $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$. Otherwise, $f(\bar{a}) \notin \{0, \dots, n-1\}$

(and again, this holds for every cyclic permutation of the arguments). Then (7) implies that $f(\sigma^i \bar{a}) = f(\sigma^i \bar{b})$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ by injectivity of g on $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Injecting this back into (7), we readily obtain $f'(\sigma \bar{a}) = f'(\sigma \bar{b})$.

To show that $\xi_2^{\text{typ}}(f')$ is cyclic, let $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_k, b_k)$ be pairs of integers. We have to show that $(f'(\bar{a}), f'(\bar{b}))$ and $(f'(\sigma \bar{a}), f'(\sigma \bar{b}))$ are in the same orbit under G_n . Since $\xi_1^{\text{typ}}(f')$ is cyclic, we already know that $f'(\bar{a})$ and $f'(\sigma \bar{a})$ are in the same orbit, and that $f'(\bar{b})$ and $f'(\sigma \bar{b})$ are in the same orbit. Note that G_n satisfies the following property: two pairs $(a, b), (c, d)$ are in the same orbit under G_n iff a, c are in the same orbit, b, d are in the same orbit and $a = b$ iff $c = d$. So we only need to check that $f'(\bar{a}) = f'(\bar{b})$ iff $f'(\sigma \bar{a}) = f'(\sigma \bar{b})$. In the left-to-right direction, this is what we proved above. For the other direction, note that we can apply $k-1$ times the argument of the previous paragraph to obtain that if $f'(\sigma \bar{a}) = f'(\sigma \bar{b})$, then $f'(\sigma^k(\bar{a})) = f'(\sigma^k(\bar{b}))$, i.e., $f'(\bar{a}) = f'(\bar{b})$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 12. We prove the implications $1 \Rightarrow 4 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 1$. We first fix the following notations. We write $\mathcal{D}$ for the clone $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A})$ and $\mathcal{C}$ for the clone $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$.

Suppose that 1 holds, that is, there is no continuous clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}_{\text{can}}(\mathbb{A})$ to $\mathcal{P}$. It follows that there is no clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}}$ to $\mathcal{P}$ and from $\mathcal{C}_{\neq}$ to $\mathcal{P}$. The assumption about the endomorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$ precisely says that $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \overline{G_n}$. By Proposition 20, there exists a cyclic operation in $\mathcal{D}_2^{\text{typ}}$. By Proposition 7, there exists an operation in $\mathcal{D}$ which is cyclic modulo endomorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$. This operation is therefore a polymorphism of $\mathbb{A}$, which is cyclic modulo endomorphisms, and which is canonical with respect to $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$. This proves 4.

The implication $4 \Rightarrow 3$ is trivial and so is the implication $3 \Rightarrow 2$. Therefore, it remains to prove that 2 implies 1. By contraposition, let us suppose that 1 does not hold. Thus, there is a continuous clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{P}$. By Proposition 6.7 in [18], there exists a clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}_2^{\text{typ}}$ to $\mathcal{P}$. By Theorem 4, there is no cyclic operation in $\mathcal{D}_2^{\text{typ}}$. By Proposition 20, either there exists a continuous clone homomorphism $\mathcal{C}_{\neq} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, or there is a clone homomorphism $\mathcal{D}_1^{\text{typ}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. In the first case we are done: we obtain by composing with $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\neq}$ a continuous clone homomorphism $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, so 2 does not hold. In the second case, Theorem 18 implies that there exists a continuous clone homomorphism from $\mathcal{C}_{c_1, \dots, c_k}$ to $\mathcal{P}$. This shows that 2 does not hold in this case either, and concludes the proof of $2 \Rightarrow 1$. $\square$

6 Lifting the Tractability Conjecture

Finally, we show that the infinite-domain tractability conjecture from [18] applied to finite-signature reducts $\mathbb{A}$ of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, 2, \dots)$ is equivalent to the tractability conjecture for finite-domain constraint satisfaction as stated in Section 4. To state the infinite-domain conjecture, we need the following concepts. An ω -categorical structure $\mathbb{A}$ is a *model-complete core* if the set of automorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$ is dense in the set of endomorphisms of $\mathbb{A}$. Examples of model-complete

cores are the structures $\mathbb{A}$ in the statement of Theorem 12. Indeed, let $\mathbb{A}$ be such a structure. The automorphism group of $\mathbb{A}$ contains all the permutations of $\mathbb{N}$ that pointwise fix $0, \dots, n-1$. Hence, if e is an injective function on $\mathbb{N}$ fixing $0, \dots, n-1$ and S is a finite subset of $\mathbb{N}$, then there is an automorphism α of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\alpha|_S = e|_S$. Therefore, e is in the topological closure of $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$, and $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{A})$ is dense in $\text{End}(\mathbb{A})$. Every ω -categorical structure is homomorphically equivalent to a model-complete core, which is unique up to isomorphism, and again ω -categorical [8].

Using a recent result of Barto and Pinsker [6], the conjecture from [18] now takes the following form when applied to the special-case of finite-signature reducts of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, 2, \dots)$.

Conjecture 21. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite-signature reduct $\mathbb{A}$ of the structure $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, \dots)$. Then $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P if the model-complete core $\mathbb{B}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ has a Siggers polymorphism modulo endomorphisms of $\mathbb{B}$, and is NP-complete otherwise.*

In combination with the algorithmic results from Section 4, Theorem 12 will take care of the situation (up to isomorphisms) where $\text{End}(\mathbb{A})$ is the set of injections that preserve $0, 1, \dots, n-1$. In the following, we reduce the general case to this situation.

We can assume that the model-complete core $\mathbb{B}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ is a substructure of $\mathbb{A}$. Indeed, if $f: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and $g: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ are homomorphisms, then $f \circ g$ is an endomorphism of $\mathbb{B}$, and is therefore an embedding $\mathbb{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}$. This implies that g is an embedding of $\mathbb{B}$ into $\mathbb{A}$. We can then replace $\mathbb{B}$ by $g(\mathbb{B}) \subseteq \mathbb{A}$.

Lemma 22. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$, and let $\mathbb{B}$ be the model-complete core of $\mathbb{A}$. Then $\mathbb{B}$ is finite or there exists an $n' \leq n$ such that $\mathbb{B}$ is isomorphic to a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n'-1)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbb{B}$ is an infinite substructure of $\mathbb{A}$. Let h be a homomorphism from $\mathbb{A}$ to $\mathbb{B}$. Let S be $\{0, \dots, n-1\} \cap B$. We prove that every permutation of B which fixes S pointwise is an automorphism of $\mathbb{B}$. Let β be such a permutation. Then β can be extended to a permutation α of $\mathbb{N}$ which fixes $0, \dots, n-1$, and therefore α is an automorphism of $\mathbb{A}$. Thus, $h \circ \beta = h \circ \alpha|_B: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is an endomorphism of $\mathbb{B}$, and so an embedding since $\mathbb{B}$ is a model-complete core. This implies that β is an embedding, i.e., it is an automorphism of $\mathbb{B}$.

Note that S is finite, and let $s_0, \dots, s_{n'-1}$ be the elements of S . We proved in the previous paragraph that the automorphism group of $\mathbb{B}$ contains all the permutations that fix S pointwise, and note that $(B; s_0, \dots, s_{n'-1})$ is an ω -categorical structure. It is a known corollary of the Ryll-Nardzewski theorem [29] that if a structure $\mathbb{C}$ is ω -categorical and $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{C}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B})$ then $\mathbb{B}$ is a reduct of $\mathbb{C}$. It follows that $\mathbb{B}$ is a first-order reduct of $(B; s_0, \dots, s_{n'-1})$, so it is isomorphic to a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n'-1)$. $\square$

Corollary 23. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n-1)$. Then there exists an expansion $\mathbb{C}$ of the model-complete core of $\mathbb{A}$ by finitely many constants such that $\mathcal{C} := \text{Pol}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfies either 1. or 2.:*

1. there is a continuous clone homomorphism $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$;
2. $\mathcal{C}$ contains a cyclic (equivalently: a Siggers, or a weak near unanimity) operation f modulo unary operations of $\mathcal{C}$; moreover, f is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{C}$.

Proof. If the model-complete core $\mathbb{B}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ is finite, then we can expand by a constant for each elements of $\mathbb{B}$, and the statement follows from Theorem 4. Otherwise, $\mathbb{B}$ is isomorphic to a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n' - 1)$ for some n' by Lemma 22. So assume that $\mathbb{B}$ is a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n' - 1)$. Then $\mathcal{C} := \text{Pol}(\mathbb{B}, 0, \dots, n' - 1)$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 12 with n' instead of n , and the statement follows directly from Theorem 12. $\square$

The following clearly implies Theorem 1 from the introduction.

Corollary 24. *The tractability conjecture for finite-domain CSPs is equivalent to Conjecture 21.*

Proof. Assume the tractability conjecture, and let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite-signature reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, 2, \dots)$. Since $\mathbb{A}$ has finite signature, it is a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}, 0, \dots, n - 1)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $c_1, \dots, c_{n'-1}$ be as in the statement of Corollary 23, and let $\mathbb{C}$ be the expansion of the model-complete core of $\mathbb{A}$ by $c_1, \dots, c_{n'-1}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{C}$ has a Siggers polymorphism modulo endomorphisms of $\mathbb{C}$ which is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{C}$. Then $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{C})$ has a Siggers polymorphism, by Lemma 8. The tractability conjecture states that the CSP of $T_{\mathbb{B},m}(\mathbb{C})$ is in P. It follows from Theorem 3 that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ is in P, too.

Now suppose that $\mathbb{C}$ does not have a Siggers polymorphism modulo endomorphisms of $\mathbb{C}$ which is canonical with respect to $\mathbb{C}$. Then Theorem 12 states that there is a continuous clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{C})$ to $\mathcal{P}$. By Theorem 1 in [17], there exists a polynomial-time reduction from, say, 3-SAT to $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$. Therefore, $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{C})$ is NP-complete.

Conversely, we show that Conjecture 21 implies the finite-domain tractability conjecture. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite relational structure on $n + 1$ elements (say $\{a_0, \dots, a_n\}$), with relations $R_1^{\mathbb{A}}, \dots, R_k^{\mathbb{A}}$. Let $p: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ be such that for $i \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$, $p(i) = a_i$ and for $i \geq n$ we define $p(i) = a_n$. Let $\mathbb{A}'$ be the structure whose domain is $\mathbb{N}$ and such that $R_i^{\mathbb{A}'}$ is $p^{-1}(R_i^{\mathbb{A}})$. It is clear that $\mathbb{A}'$ is a reduct of $(\mathbb{N}; 0, \dots, n - 1)$. Moreover, $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{A}'$ are homomorphically equivalent. Indeed, p is by construction a homomorphism from $\mathbb{A}'$ to $\mathbb{A}$, and we can embed $\mathbb{A}$ into $\mathbb{A}'$ by sending a_i to i . Therefore the model-complete core of $\mathbb{A}$ and of $\mathbb{A}'$ coincide.

If $\mathbb{A}$ has a Siggers polymorphism, then its core also has a Siggers polymorphism; this follows from the fact that the two structures are homomorphically equivalent. Hence, the model-complete core of $\mathbb{A}'$ has a Siggers polymorphism, too. Now the hypothesis entails that $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A}')$ and therefore $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ is in P. $\square$

We mention that using the results from [19], it can be shown that the condition in Conjecture 21 is decidable, for given first-order formulas that define the relations of $\mathbb{A}$ over $(\mathbb{N}; 0, 1, \dots)$. Finally, we believe that Conjecture 21 also

holds for all CSPs expressible in the logic MMSNP introduced by Feder and Vardi [27]. It is already known that this logic has a complexity dichotomy if and only if finite-domain CSPs have dichotomy, but the proof requires [36] and it would be interesting to by-pass this.

References

- [1] Albert Atserias, Andrei A. Bulatov, and Anuj Dawar. Affine systems of equations and counting infinitary logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(18):1666–1683, 2009.
- [2] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Constraint satisfaction problems of bounded width. In *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 595–603, 2009.
- [3] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Absorbing subalgebras, cyclic terms and the constraint satisfaction problem. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8/1(07):1–26, 2012.
- [4] Libor Barto, Marcin Kozik, and Todd Niven. The CSP dichotomy holds for digraphs with no sources and no sinks (a positive answer to a conjecture of Bang-Jensen and Hell). *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(5), 2009.
- [5] Libor Barto, Jakub Opršal, and Michael Pinsker. The wonderland of reflections. Preprint arXiv:1510.04521, 2015.
- [6] Libor Barto and Michael Pinsker. The algebraic dichotomy conjecture for infinite domain constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings of LICS’16*, 2016. Preprint arXiv:1602.04353.
- [7] Garrett Birkhoff. On the structure of abstract algebras. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 31(4):433–454, 1935.
- [8] Manuel Bodirsky. Cores of countably categorical structures. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(1):1–16, 2007.
- [9] Manuel Bodirsky. Complexity classification in infinite-domain constraint satisfaction. Mémoire d’habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Diderot – Paris 7. Available at arXiv:1201.0856, 2012.
- [10] Manuel Bodirsky and Víctor Dalmau. Datalog and constraint satisfaction with infinite templates. *Journal on Computer and System Sciences*, 79:79–100, 2013. A preliminary version appeared in the proceedings of the Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS’05).
- [11] Manuel Bodirsky, Peter Jonsson, and Trung Van Pham. The complexity of phylogeny constraint satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, 2016. Preprint arXiv:1503.07310.

- [12] Manuel Bodirsky and Jan Kára. The complexity of equality constraint languages. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 3(2):136–158, 2008. A conference version appeared in the proceedings of Computer Science Russia (CSR’06).
- [13] Manuel Bodirsky and Jan Kára. The complexity of temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2):1–41, 2009. An extended abstract appeared in the Proceedings of the Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC).
- [14] Manuel Bodirsky, Antoine Mottet, and Barnaby Martin. Constraint satisfaction problems over the integers with successor. In *Proceedings of ICALP*, 2015. ArXiv:1503.08572.
- [15] Manuel Bodirsky, Antoine Mottet, and Barnaby Martin. Discrete temporal constraint satisfaction problems. Submitted, 2016.
- [16] Manuel Bodirsky and Michael Pinsker. Schaefer’s theorem for graphs. *Journal of the ACM*, 62(3):52 pages (article number 19), 2015. A conference version appeared in the Proceedings of STOC 2011, pages 655–664.
- [17] Manuel Bodirsky and Michael Pinsker. Topological Birkhoff. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 367:2527–2549, 2015.
- [18] Manuel Bodirsky, Michael Pinsker, and András Pongrácz. Projective clone homomorphisms. Preprint arXiv:1409.4601, 2014.
- [19] Manuel Bodirsky, Michael Pinsker, and Todor Tsankov. Decidability of definability. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 78(4):1036–1054, 2013. A conference version appeared in the Proceedings of LICS 2011.
- [20] Manuel Bodirsky and Michal Wrona. Equivalence constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings of Computer Science Logic*, volume 16 of *LIPICS*, pages 122–136. Dagstuhl Publishing, September 2012.
- [21] Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Bartek Klin, and Slawomir Lasota. Automata theory in nominal sets. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 10(3), 2014.
- [22] Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Bartek Klin, Slawomir Lasota, and Szymon Toruńczyk. Turing machines with atoms. In *28th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2013, New Orleans, LA, USA.*, pages 183–192, 2013.
- [23] Mathias Broxvall and Peter Jonsson. Point algebras for temporal reasoning: Algorithms and complexity. *Artificial Intelligence*, 149(2):179–220, 2003.
- [24] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set. *Journal of the ACM*, 53(1):66–120, 2006.
- [25] Andrei A. Bulatov and Peter Jeavons. Algebraic structures in combinatorial problems. Technical report MATH-AL-4-2001, Technische Universität Dresden, 2001.

- [26] Andrei A. Bulatov, Andrei A. Krokhin, and Peter G. Jeavons. Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34:720–742, 2005.
- [27] Tomás Feder and Moshe Y. Vardi. The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction: a study through Datalog and group theory. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28:57–104, 1999.
- [28] Pavol Hell and Jaroslav Nešetřil. On the complexity of H-coloring. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 48:92–110, 1990.
- [29] Wilfrid Hodges. *A shorter model theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [30] Peter Jeavons, David Cohen, and Marc Gyssens. Closure properties of constraints. *Journal of the ACM*, 44(4):527–548, 1997.
- [31] Peter Jonsson and Thomas Drakengren. A complete classification of tractability in RCC-5. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 6:211–221, 1997.
- [32] Peter Jonsson and Johan Thapper. Constraint satisfaction and semi-linear expansions of addition over the rationals and the reals. *CoRR*, abs/1506.00479, 2015.
- [33] Bartek Klin, Eryk Kopczynski, Joanna Ochremiak, and Szymon Toruńczyk. Locally finite constraint satisfaction problems. In *30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2015, Kyoto, Japan.*, pages 475–486, 2015.
- [34] Bartek Klin, Slawomir Lasota, Joanna Ochremiak, and Szymon Toruńczyk. Turing machines with atoms, constraint satisfaction problems, and descriptive complexity. In *Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL) and Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS), CSL-LICS’14, Vienna, Austria.*, pages 58:1–58:10, 2014.
- [35] Marcin Kozik, Andrei Krokhin, Matt Valeriote, and Ross Willard. Characterizations of several maltsev conditions. *Algebra universalis*, 73(3):205–224, 2015.
- [36] Gábor Kun. Constraints, MMSNP, and expander relational structures. *Combinatorica*, 33(3):335–347, 2013.
- [37] M. Maróti and R. McKenzie. Existence theorems for weakly symmetric operations. *Algebra Universalis*, 59(3), 2008.
- [38] Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 216–226, 1978.

- [39] Mark H. Siggers. A strong Mal'cev condition for varieties omitting the unary type. *Algebra Universalis*, 64(1):15–20, 2010.